

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-22 are pending in this case. Claims 1-17, 21, and 22 have been allowed. Claims 19 and 20 stand objected to. No claims have been amended herein.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Raymond (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,353). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 18 includes the feature of "a plurality of pins each having a series of contact marks, each set of contact marks being of substantially the same pattern and spaced by a predetermined pitch." Raymond does not disclose or suggest such a feature. The Examiner has identified element 404 in Raymond's Figure 4 as "a series of contact marks." However, Raymond (col. 6, line 59) refers to element 404 as a "key-point." In col. 4, lines 13-17, Raymond says that a key-point is "a location on a surface of a component, a solder connection, or the BUT." Also, "each key-point serves as a target for light source 110." All of which is consistent with Raymond's statement in col. 3, lines 3-5 that "[d]uring a test, the height of each key-point associated with a selected component is measured relative to a local reference." Therefore, it is clear that Raymond's key-points are not contact marks, but are merely locations that serve as a target for a light source. Moreover, Claim 18 describes each of the plurality of pins as having "a series of contact marks. Even if one were to assume for the

sake of argument that Raymond's key-points are contact marks, each of Raymond's leads 406 only has a single key-point, not a series of contact marks where each set of contact marks is substantially the same pattern and spaced by a predetermined pitch. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 18 is patentable over Raymond.

Claims 19 and 20 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. In view of the arguments above in favor of the patentability of Claim 18 from which Claims 19 and 20 depend, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Reply to Examiner's *Response to Arguments*

The Examiner's statement in support of maintaining the rejection of Claim 18 includes the following statement: "[w]hile it is true that elements 404 are key-points, they are also contact points." Applicant respectfully submits that this fact has no relevance to Claim 18. Claim 18 deals with contact *marks*, not points or locations. These marks provide "a visual indication that sufficient contact was made [specification, page 9, last line]." In *Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary*, 1984, Houghton Mifflin Co., "mark" is defined as "a visible trace or impression, as a spot, dent, or line." Raymond does not disclose contact marks, nor does he disclose "contact marks being of substantially the same pattern and spaced by a predetermined pitch" as described in Claim 18.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of Claims 1-22. If the Examiner has any questions or other correspondence regarding this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's attorney at the below listed telephone number and address.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael K. Skrehot
Reg. No. 36,682

Texas Instruments Incorporated
~~P.O. Box 655474, M/S 3999~~
Dallas, TX 75265
Phone: 972 917-5653
Fax: 972 917-4418